



**CLARK COUNTY, WA
AUDITOR'S OFFICE**

**CUSTOMER SURVEY
RESULTS FOR THE
DEPARTMENT OF
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT**

FINAL REPORT

DECEMBER 16, 2002



TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>SECTION</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
A. Project Background.....	1
B. Customer Survey Methodology and Composition of Respondents.....	1
C. Comparative Analysis of the Customer Survey Results.....	3
Summary	3
Community Development Department	4
Development Services Division.....	6
Long Range Planning Division.....	8
Building Division.....	9
Fire Marshal Division	11
Engineering Division	12
Final Concerns and Solutions	14
Conclusion	15
Appendix A.....	2000 Customer Survey Results
Appendix B.....	2002 Customer Survey Instrument
Appendix C.....	2002 Detailed Survey Results

CUSTOMER SURVEY RESULTS

A. PROJECT BACKGROUND

In 2000, Citygate Associates LLC conducted a Performance Audit of the Clark County, Washington Department of Community Development (the Department). This project was performed under the auspices of the Clark County Auditor's Office. The purpose of the Performance Audit was to analyze the policies, procedures, management and operations of the Department's development review process, and to develop creative recommendations for improvement. As part of the audit, Citygate Associates developed and conducted a Customer Survey designed to examine respondent perceptions of customer service, staff quality, permit processing, code interpretation, inspections and potential improvements. The 2000 Customer Survey Results are presented in **Appendix A**.

The Performance Audit generated 42 recommendations, 6 of which were classified as having strategic importance; greatly impacting the Department's ability to provide efficient and effective service to its customers. During the past 24 months, the Department has implemented 18 recommendations, is in the process of implementing 18 other recommendations, and has taken alternative action or has not implemented 6 recommendations. To measure the implementation process, the Clark County Auditor's Office issued Report # F02-1 on September 5, 2002 entitled "Department of Community Development: Implementation of Performance Audit Recommendations." The objectives of the Auditor's report were to:

- 1) Determine the degree to which the Department had implemented the 42 recommendations made in the December 2000 performance audit;
- 2) Identify and describe the actions the Department has taken to date to implement each recommendation; and
- 3) Identify areas for further review with regard to the effectiveness of the Department's implementation.

The scope of the Auditor's report did not involve assessing the effectiveness of the Department's implementation actions. However, as an aid to assessing the effectiveness, the Auditor's Office engaged Citygate Associates to re-administer a Customer Survey. The following report presents the results of the 2002 re-administered Customer Survey conducted by Citygate.

B. CUSTOMER SURVEY METHODOLOGY AND COMPOSITION OF RESPONDENTS

Citygate Associates administered a Follow-up Customer Survey to evaluate the satisfaction of the Clark County Community Development Department customers. The goal of this project was two-fold:

- 1) Compare the current survey results to the 2000 Customer Survey; and
- 2) Assess the impact of the implementation of Citygate's December 2000 Performance Audit recommendations on customers. A status report of the Department's implementation progress is outlined in the September 2002 Implementation of

Performance Audit Recommendations Report prepared by the Clark County Auditor's Office.

One of the key requirements of the 2002 re-administration of the Customer Survey was to conduct the survey using the same methodology employed in 2000, so that differences in customer perception could be isolated to actual changes in the Department's practices and performance. Therefore, the survey instrument used was identical to the 2000 survey, with the exception of the addition of an Engineering Division section and the addition of one question within Question #8. A copy of the 2002 Customer Survey Instrument is presented in **Appendix B**. The 2002 Detailed Survey Results are presented in **Appendix C**.

The 2002 survey was randomly distributed, with aid from the Auditor's Office and Community Development Department staff, to 969 recent customers of the Development Services, Long Range Planning, Building, Fire Marshal and Engineering Divisions. The size of the customer sample used in the current 2002 survey was very close to the size used in the 2000 sample, with the exception of a new sub-sample group (Engineering). In 2000, the engineering function was a component of the Community Services Division; in 2002, the survey instrument and the sampling were revised to accommodate Engineering's reorganized status as a separate Division within the Department. The following table shows the sampling of customers for each Division that was mailed a survey:

Division	<i>2000 Number of Customers Sampled</i>	2002 Number of Customers Sampled
Building	<i>301</i>	301
Development Services	<i>308</i>	284
Fire Marshal	<i>125</i>	127
Engineering	<i>NA</i>	124
Long-Range Planning (Includes Neighborhood Stakeholders)	<i>100</i>	133
TOTAL	<i>800+</i>	969

Surveys were returned in a manner that promoted confidentiality via mail to the County Auditor, whose staff then batched the unopened surveys and forwarded the completed surveys to Citygate's office. Once Citygate received the survey envelopes, they were opened, tabulated and analyzed. The returned surveys totaled 154, for a response rate of 15.9 percent. In 2000, the returned surveys totaled 149, for a response rate of 18.6 percent.

The survey instrument allowed for respondents to fall into one or more response groups that described the type of interactions they had with the Community Development Department. A breakdown of the respondent composition is presented in the following table. Not only did respondents indicate the type of customer they were, but respondents also identified the type of construction they were involved in and their frequency of interaction with the Department. Since respondents were able to select more than one choice, the totals below exceed 100 percent.

RESPONDENT COMPOSITION

Respondent Type	<i>2000 Percentage of Respondents</i>	2002 Percentage of Respondents
Neighborhood Stakeholder	28.2%	20.1%
Developer/Builder	46.3%	37%
Development Consultant	21.5%	26.6%
General Contractor/Sub-Contractor	30.9%	30.5%
Type of Construction		
Single Family Detached	57.0%	51.9%
Single Family Attached/Multi-family	29.5%	25.3%
Commercial/Industrial	49.7%	34.4%
Reason for Interaction		
New Construction Project	79.9%	70.1%
Modification to Existing Project	19.5%	14.9%
Both	30.2%	26.6%
Frequency of Interaction		
Frequent Customer	83.2%	77.9%
One-time Customer	33.6%	36.4%

The customers responded to questions on a scale of one to three. For example, a score of 1 would show a low level of satisfaction, while a score of 3 would demonstrate a high level of satisfaction. For the reader's convenience, we translated the mean scores to a letter grade based on the following scale:

Letter Grade Corresponding to Range of Mean Scores	
A+	2.87 – 3.00
A	2.74 – 2.86
A-	2.60 – 2.73
B+	2.47 – 2.59
B	2.34 – 2.46
B-	2.20 – 2.33
C+	2.07 – 2.19
C	1.94 – 2.06
C-	1.80 – 1.93
D+	1.67 – 1.79
D	1.54 – 1.66
D-	1.40 – 1.53
F	1.00 – 1.39

C. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE CUSTOMER SURVEY RESULTS

Summary

The results of this survey indicate that during the last year the Community Development Department has enhanced performance to increase their level of customer service. As a result of

the many recommendations the Department has implemented or is in the process of implementing, a majority of the customer satisfaction scores for the Department and its Divisions have slightly improved. Overall, out of the comparable 80 close-ended questions, 49 of the letter grades were raised. It is important to note also that some questions had an improved numerical score, but not a significantly sufficient increase to enhance the letter grade. Additionally, there were 5 questions with a lowered letter grade, and 26 questions that remained with the same letter grade.

The respondents showed an increased satisfaction with the overall positive attitude of the staff and further improvements in such areas as courtesy, timeliness, dependability and reliability. The results also indicate that respondents have an increased satisfaction with the staff's knowledge, problem-solving ability, level of discretion, quality of advice and decision-making capability.

On the other hand, within all the Divisions the respondents showed a decrease in customer satisfaction regarding application fees and costs. While the Department is making efforts to implement the various cost-of-service and fee recommendations, customer satisfaction on this dimension has declined.

Overall, the Department's aim at improving customer service through recommendation implementation has proven to be effective. The results indicate an upward trend in meeting customer expectations, and given the persistent "diligence" towards continuous improvement, the Department should realize cumulative increases in customer satisfaction over time.

In this report, the comparative results are displayed and discussed for the Department as a whole, followed by the comparative results for each Division. For the reader's convenience, letter grades in "blue" represent an increase from the previous grade in 2000, "black" represents no change, and "red" represents a decrease from the previous grade.

Community Development Department

Question 2 asks customers to "rate the Community Development Department in the following areas." The comparative results are displayed in the table below.

Question 2	2000 Grade	2002 Grade	2000 Average Score	2002 Average Score	Point Difference
Courtesy	<i>B</i>	B+	2.37	2.54	0.17
Timeliness	<i>D</i>	C-	1.55	1.83	0.28
Positive Attitude	<i>C</i>	B-	1.96	2.21	0.25
Knowledge	<i>C+</i>	B-	2.14	2.27	0.13
Dependability / Reliability	<i>D+</i>	C	1.77	2.04	0.27
Consistency	<i>D+</i>	C	1.73	1.97	0.24
Fairness / Objectivity	<i>C</i>	C+	1.97	2.08	0.11
Problem Solving Ability	<i>D+</i>	C	1.75	1.99	0.24
Returning Phone Calls	<i>D+</i>	C	1.67	2.02	0.35
Quality of Advice	<i>C</i>	C+	1.94	2.12	0.18
Understanding of Private Business	<i>D-</i>	D	1.5	1.57	0.07
Decision-making Capability	<i>D+</i>	C-	1.71	1.87	0.16
Level of Discretion	<i>C</i>	C+	2.01	2.19	0.18
Overall Performance	<i>C-</i>	C	1.81	2.05	0.24

Question 2	2000 Grade	2002 Grade	2000 Average Score	2002 Average Score	Point Difference
Overall Score	C-	C	1.85	2.05	0.20

From the results above, the Community Development Department raised its overall score from the previous C- to a C by incrementally enhancing their performance to address customer service needs in all survey areas. The most significant of these improvements have been an increase in the staff's responsiveness to returning phone calls, timeliness, dependability and reliability, ability to solve problems, consistency and overall performance. Further, the Department staff has increased its positive attitude, and continues to be courteous and knowledgeable. One area for continued improvement is the Department staff's understanding of private business, and although its score rose slightly, it remained below average.

Neighborhood stakeholders and general/sub-contractors continue to have a better opinion of the service provided by the Department. Further, those customers involved in modification to homes were more pleased than those involved in the new construction of homes. Overall, one-time customers were more satisfied with service than frequent customers.

The following pages summarize the comparative results and the positive and negative changes by each Division within the context of the Auditor's report regarding recommendation implementation. As appropriate for each Division, respondent comments are included to offer further insight regarding customer satisfaction and to provide additional information concerning suggestions for improvement.

Development Services Division

Question 3 asks customers to assess “how the Development Services Division compares to your expectations for government service.” The comparative results are displayed in the table below.

Question 3	2000 Grade	2002 Grade	2000 Average Score	2002 Average Score	Point Difference
Helpfulness of Front Counter Assistance	C	C+	2.04	2.15	0.11
Informative Brochures and Handouts	C	C	1.98	1.96	-0.02
Pre-application Review Meeting	D	C-	1.61	1.86	0.25
Usefulness of Pre-application Review Written Comments	D+	D+	1.73	1.78	0.05
Application Checklist Requirements	C-	C-	1.82	1.80	-0.02
Cost of Processing Application (fees)	C	C-	1.94	1.87	-0.07
Process for Deeming Application Complete	D-	D	1.46	1.58	0.12
Thoroughness of Plan Review	D	C-	1.66	1.80	0.14
Processing / Turnaround Times of Plan Review	D-	D-	1.4	1.51	0.11
Timeliness of Staff Written Comments	D-	D+	1.45	1.67	0.22
Clarity of Development Code	D	D	1.64	1.61	-0.03
Fairness / Consistency of Code Interpretations	D+	D	1.74	1.58	-0.16
Communication on Project Status	D-	D+	1.4	1.71	0.31
Use of Technology	C-	C	1.87	2.00	0.13
Staff Dependability	D	C-	1.59	1.83	0.24
Coordinating Review with Other Divisions/Departments	D-	D	1.43	1.61	0.18
Hearing Examiner Review Process	C	C	1.94	2.00	0.06
Appeals Process	D+	C-	1.69	1.84	0.15
Site Development Review Process	D-	D	1.44	1.61	0.17
Process of “Minor” Changes to Plans	D	D+	1.59	1.68	0.09
Timeliness of Re-checks	F	D+	1.39	1.67	0.28
Process for Final Plat Map Approval	F	D	1.38	1.54	0.16
Process for Listening to Customer Concerns	D-	D+	1.51	1.75	0.24
Overall Process	F	D+	1.36	1.68	0.32
Overall Score	D	D+	1.63	1.75	0.13

Positive Changes

The overall process employed by the Development Services Division received the most significant increase in score, followed by increased scores in areas such as the communication on project status, the pre-application review meeting, staff dependability, the timeliness of re-checks and staff written comments, and the process for listening to customers. The respondent comments noted an improved consistency in processes, better ability to work with customers, a more positive and helpful attitude, and an increased willingness to communicate and cooperate.

Although there exists room for improvement, the results indicate that the Division is headed in the right direction by no longer having any “failing” grades.

The performance audit included 11 recommendations for this Division, with 7 being in the process of implementation, 2 being implemented alternatively, 1 being implemented “as-is,” and 1 not being implemented.

The following table shows the strategic recommendations that have either been implemented in an alternative form, or are in the process of being implemented “as-is.” Further, the table highlights the areas where the recommendations have contributed to an increase in customer satisfaction.

Recommendations	Improved Division Survey Areas
#1: Streamline Deemed Fully Complete Process	- Process for Deeming Application Complete
#2: Case Management	- Coordinating Review with Other Divisions/Departments
#4: Employee Accountability	- Helpfulness of Front Counter - Pre-application Review Meeting - Timeliness of Staff Written Comments - Staff Dependability - Process for Listening to Customer Concerns
#5: Director’s Authority	- Appeals Process
#6: Engineering Review Time	- Pre-application Review Meeting - Timeliness of Staff Written Comments - Process for Final Plat Map Approval

Negative Changes

The two areas for which customer satisfaction decreased in the Development Services Division include the cost of processing application (fees) and the fairness/consistency of code interpretations.

Customer Suggestions for Improved Service

Customer suggestions for improvement in this Division include:

- ◆ Development rules need to be changed.
- ◆ Need faster turnaround times and lower fees.
- ◆ Let public know their rights and roles.

- ◆ Simplify the process and make it quicker.
- ◆ Need consistency at the counter.
- ◆ Send code changes to all builders via e-mail/mail.
- ◆ Review very minor checklist items to allow staff to use logic in their application.
- ◆ Put what needs to be completed in writing.
- ◆ Use phone more effectively.
- ◆ Coordination of information/paperwork regarding status of projects needs to be improved.
- ◆ More availability of counter service staff would be helpful.
- ◆ Let customers know of all requirements at pre-application conference.
- ◆ Front-counter personnel should be more knowledgeable regarding zoning restriction, variances, and changes in land use.

Long Range Planning Division

Question 4 asks customers to assess “how the Long Range Planning Division compares to your expectations for government service.” The comparative results are displayed in the table below.

Question 4	2000 Grade	2002 Grade	2000 Average Score	2002 Average Score	Point Difference
Helpfulness of Front Counter Assistance	C	C	1.96	2.00	0.04
Informative Brochures and Handouts	C-	C	1.88	1.94	0.06
Cost of Processing Application (fees)	C	C-	1.94	1.83	-0.11
Application Checklist Requirements	C-	C-	1.83	1.87	0.04
Fairness / Consistency of Code Interpretations	D+	D+	1.7	1.67	-0.03
Communication on Status of Work	D	D+	1.57	1.79	0.22
Use of Modern Planning Practices	D+	C-	1.7	1.93	0.23
Receptive to Change	D-	D	1.42	1.55	0.13
Use of Technology	D+	C	1.73	1.98	0.25
Staff Dependability	D	C-	1.6	1.86	0.26
Coordinating Review with other Departments/Divisions	D	D	1.55	1.65	0.10
Timeliness of Staff Written Comments	D-	D+	1.47	1.70	0.23
Overall Process	D	C-	1.6	1.80	0.20
Overall Score	D+	C-	1.69	1.81	0.12

Positive Changes

The overall grade and score for this Division indicate an incremental improvement towards meeting customer expectations. The results show an increase of satisfaction in most survey areas, including staff dependability, use of technology, communication on status of work, timeliness of staff written comments, and the use of modern planning practices. Respondents for

this Division noted improvements with consistency of approach, staff problem solving, friendliness and helpfulness, meeting deadlines and improved coordination. Some of these improvements can be partly attributed to the implementation of Recommendation #16 regarding the ongoing surveying of Long Range Planning Division customer satisfaction.

Areas for improvement include the helpfulness of front counter assistance, application checklist requirements, fairness/consistency of code interpretations and coordinating with other departments/divisions.

Negative Changes

Customers indicated a decreased satisfaction with the cost of processing applications (fees).

Customer Suggestions for Improved Service

Customer suggestions for improvement in this Division include:

- ◆ Focus attention on “zone change process.”
- ◆ Communicate with the general public in a more simple, understandable way.
- ◆ Focus attention on “infill procedures.”
- ◆ More cross-sectional residential committees on critical issues.
- ◆ Focus on work plan that they can convey to the public and which the public can comprehend and understand for better input.
- ◆ Shorten the term for approval.
- ◆ Clarity of overall goals.
- ◆ Better up-front information.

Building Division

Question 5 asks customers to assess “how the Building Division compares to your expectations for government service.” The comparative results are displayed in the table below.

Question 5	2000 Grade	2002 Grade	2000 Average Score	2002 Average Score	Point Difference
Helpfulness of Front Counter Assistance	B-	B-	2.21	2.32	0.11
Informative Brochures and Handouts	C	C	2.01	2.00	-0.01
Cost of Permits (fees)	C	C-	1.97	1.87	-0.10
Thoroughness of Plan Review	C-	C	1.88	2.00	0.12
Processing / Turnaround Times of Plan Review	D	D+	1.54	1.69	0.15
Complexity of Regulations	C-	C	1.88	1.94	0.06
Fairness / Consistency of Code Interpretations	D+	C-	1.76	1.88	0.12
Communication on Project Status	D	C-	1.62	1.85	0.23
Use of Technology	C-	C	1.9	1.99	0.09
Staff Dependability	D+	C	1.78	2.05	0.27
Timeliness of Inspections	C	B-	1.98	2.22	0.24
Thoroughness of Inspections	C	C+	2.05	2.10	0.05
Fairness of Inspections	C	C	1.98	1.99	0.01

Question 5	2000 Grade	2002 Grade	2000 Average Score	2002 Average Score	Point Difference
Conflicts between Inspectors and Approved Plans	C-	C-	1.9	1.80	-0.10
Overall Process	C-	C+	1.84	2.09	0.25
Overall Score	C-	C	1.89	1.99	0.10

Positive Changes

The overall process and score for this Division indicate that the ability to meet customer expectations has improved, and that for the most part the Division is continuing to provide adequate services. The most improved areas of satisfaction include staff dependability, the overall process employed by the Division, timeliness of inspections and fairness/consistency of code interpretations. Respondents noted a continued good work attitude by staff, that help is always great and the 'counter techs' are the best. Further noted improvements included friendliness, a more positive and helpful attitude, quicker permit processing, quicker turn around time for plan review, more timely inspections, quicker conflict resolution and improved billing processes.

A number of recommendations were implemented that have contributed to the improved scores for this Division. There are 15 recommendations for this Division, with 5 already implemented, 9 being in the process of implementation, and 1 not being implemented.

The following table shows some of the Building Division recommendations that have either been implemented, or is in the process of being implemented, which have contributed to an increase in customer satisfaction for the highlighted survey areas.

Recommendations	Improved Division Survey Areas
#19: Quality of Building Plan Reviews	- Thoroughness of Plan Review
#20: Reduce Re-inspections	- Timeliness of Inspections - Thoroughness of Inspections
#23: Hire Support Staff	- Communication on Project Status
#25: Building Code Interpretation	- Fairness/Consistency of Code Interpretations
#28: Customer Service Expectations	- Staff Dependability - Overall Process
#29: Computer Tracking Problems	- Use of Technology

Negative Changes

The only area where satisfaction decreased in the Building Division was with the cost of permits.

Customer Suggestions for Improved Service

Customer suggestions for improvement in this Division include:

- ◆ More “plan review” inspectors so building permits can be released faster.
- ◆ Improved uniformity/consistency in code interpretations.
- ◆ Return phone calls sooner.
- ◆ More efficient processing times during the busy season.
- ◆ Send updates and all code changes to builders via e-mail or mail.
- ◆ Improved technology (online project status).
- ◆ A need for a speedier process, especially for commercial plan check, with more dependable turn around times.
- ◆ Additional counter staff.
- ◆ More consistent application of codes.
- ◆ Standardize inspection process.
- ◆ Ability to “drop off” permits and plans without having to wait to give them to staff.
- ◆ Provide more detailed feedback to builder regarding building inspection correction form.
- ◆ Plan review needs to be more thorough and turn around is too slow.

Fire Marshal Division

Question 6 asks customers to assess “how the Fire Marshal Division compares to your expectations for government service.” The comparative results are displayed in the table below.

Question 6	2000 Grade	2002 Grade	2000 Average Score	2002 Average Score	Point Difference
Informative Publications/Handouts/ Brochures	C	C	1.94	2.05	0.11
Cost of Permits (fees)	C+	C	2.11	2.06	-0.05
Thoroughness of Plan Review	C	C	1.98	1.97	-0.01
Processing / Turnaround Times of Plan Review	C-	C-	1.88	1.89	0.01
Complexity of Regulations	C-	C-	1.89	1.89	0.00
Fairness / Consistency of Code Interpretations	C-	C-	1.87	1.83	-0.04
Communication on Project Status	C-	C-	1.89	1.89	0.00
Use of Technology	C-	C-	1.87	1.93	0.06
Staff Dependability	C	C	2.03	2.05	0.02
Timeliness of Inspections	C+	C+	2.09	2.11	0.02
Thoroughness of Inspections	C+	C+	2.09	2.13	0.04
Fairness of Inspections	C	C+	2.02	2.09	0.07
Conflicts between Inspectors and Approved Plans	C-	C-	1.87	1.89	0.02
Overall Process	C	C	2.02	2.06	0.04
Overall Score	C	C	1.97	1.99	0.02

Positive Changes

The results for the Fire Marshal Division indicate a minimal change in its performance to provide customer service and meet customer expectations. The fairness of inspections was an area for which customers had a slight increase in satisfaction. Respondents commented on improvements with the timeliness and thoroughness of inspections, willingness to listen to and accept alternatives solutions, and improved communication. Respondents further noted continued promptness and thoroughness, good and quick service, trustworthiness, fairness, being on time and helpful and creativity.

Negative Changes

The cost of permits (fees) is an area for which customers had a slight decrease in satisfaction.

Customer Suggestions for Improved Service

Customer suggestions for improvement in this Division include:

- ◆ Improve plan review services.
- ◆ Fire Districts should do reviews on projects within their districts.
- ◆ Better consultation with fire chiefs in areas affected by developments.
- ◆ Lower costs (standards).
- ◆ Tennant improvement process needs a major overhaul in terms of overall process.
- ◆ Focus attention on fire prevention.
- ◆ Better understanding of the issues facing private industry.
- ◆ Maintain one inspector for entire project.

Engineering Division

Question 7 asks customers to assess “how the Engineering Division compares to your expectations for government service.” The results are displayed in the table below.

Question 7	2002 Grade	2002 Average Score
Helpfulness of Front Counter Assistance	C	1.96
Informative Brochures and Handouts	C-	1.80
Application Checklist Requirements	C-	1.81
Cost of Processing Application (fees)	C-	1.83
Process for Deeming Application Complete	D+	1.67
Thoroughness of Construction Plan Review	D+	1.75
Processing / Turnaround Times of Construction Plan Review	D	1.54
Timeliness of Staff Written Comments	D	1.66
Clarity of Development Code	D+	1.67
Fairness / Consistency of Code Interpretations	D	1.60

Question 7	2002 Grade	2002 Average Score
Communication on Project Status	D	1.63
Use of Technology	C-	1.92
Staff Dependability	D+	1.75
Coordinating Review with Other Divisions/Departments	D	1.60
Timeliness of Development Inspection	C	1.95
Fairness / Consistency of Development Inspection	C-	1.85
Process of "Minor" Changes to Plans	D+	1.71
Timeliness of Re-checks	D	1.62
Number of Re-checks	D	1.58
Process for Final Site Plan Approval	D	1.56
Process for Final Plat Map Approval	D	1.54
Process for Listening to Customer Concerns	D+	1.73
Overall Process	D+	1.67
Overall Score	D+	1.71

The newly created Engineering Division was not surveyed in Citygate's 2000 Customer Survey. It received its highest scores on the helpfulness of front counter assistance, timeliness of development inspection and its use of technology. Even though the Division's overall scores were poor, some individual respondents had positive comments. They noted that staff is very friendly, helpful and doing a fantastic job, and that written comments have improved in respect to time frames, the positive outreach process to hear stakeholder issues, and coordination with other divisions.

It garnered its lowest scores on the process for final site plan and final plat map approval, processing/turnaround times of construction plan review and number of re-checks.

Customer Suggestions for Improved Service

Customer suggestions for improvement in this Division include:

- ◆ Timely reviews, written comments and callbacks.
- ◆ Simplify the processes.
- ◆ More courtesy by staff toward engineering professionals.
- ◆ Consistency in code interpretations.
- ◆ More attention to traffic safety and concerns for traffic movement.
- ◆ Lower costs.
- ◆ Implement suggestions derived from the stakeholder outreach process.
- ◆ Review plans only for code compliance.
- ◆ Stop holding up approval of engineering plans as a way of imposing requirements not supported by code.
- ◆ Stop allowing engineering technicians to review professional engineers' work.

- ◆ Consider the overall impacts based on the facilities.
- ◆ There should not be several reviews per project for construction plans.
- ◆ Speed up the approval process to a maximum 3 months.
- ◆ Better coordination with fire marshal to reduce the delay in approval.
- ◆ Better coordination with planning for site plan approval to reduce delay.
- ◆ Project should be kept with one review staff member through completion.
- ◆ Staff should not be allowed to add revisions/changes based on differing opinions after the 2nd review.

Final Concerns and Solutions

The final survey questions allowed respondents to consider various solutions to their concerns, as well as gather very general information about the cost of doing business in Clark County. The results are found below. Respondents who answered “not applicable” or left the question blank are not considered in the analysis below.

POTENTIAL SOLUTIONS

Question 8	2000 % Answering "Yes"	2002 % Answering "Yes"	2000 % Answering "No"	2002 % Answering "No"
Initial information given to me by the Department was accurate.	62%	77%	38%	23%
The Department required changes after initial plan check.	63%	63%	37%	37%
The Department required changes after the second plan check.	NA	56%	NA	44%
If it were guaranteed that an increase in fees would increase timeliness and quality of services, I would support a fee increase.	35%	34%	65%	66%
I would welcome the option to pay extra for “express processing”	51%	49%	49%	51%
I would support a faster, more streamlined development process, even if it meant more “black and white/pass or fail” requirements and fewer negotiations.	52%	42%	48%	58%
I charge my clients more for services I perform in Clark County than other jurisdictions in the Portland metropolitan area.	49%	50%	51%	50%
The cost of processing any permit is approximately the same as other jurisdictions in the Portland/Vancouver metropolitan area.	28%	31%	72%	69%

As indicated above, there was little change in customer responses. However, the Department has increased their ability to provide accurate initial information. This can be one of the reasons of why the overall customer satisfaction has increased; giving customers accurate information at the starting point of the processes will help ensure that customers are made aware of the requirements, updates, changes, deadlines, communication timelines, etc. in order to get through the process in a more efficient, effective and timely manner.

Conclusion

As stated in the Final Report of Citygate's 2000 Performance Audit of the Clark County Community Development Department:

"By implementing the recommendations presented in this report, the Department can improve customers' perceptions of its service delivery, and at the same time, enhance the Department's credibility."

The results of this project to re-administer a Customer Survey indicate that indeed, the Department has incrementally raised its ability to meet customer expectations, thus increasing satisfaction and credibility. The Department's efforts toward the implementation of recommendations and continual improvement prove to be effective tools in better meeting the needs of its customers. At the same time, much improvement remains to be completed to perform at the levels of excellence desired by Clark County.

Appendix A – 2000 Customer Survey Results

III. CUSTOMER SURVEY RESULTS

A. CUSTOMER SURVEY METHODOLOGY AND COMPOSITION OF RESPONDENTS

Citygate Associates developed a 117-question survey instrument for the Community Development Department aimed at evaluating customer satisfaction. The combination of open- and closed-ended questions were aimed at examining respondent perceptions of customer service, staff quality, permit processing, code interpretation, inspections and potential improvements. A copy of the survey instrument is presented in **Appendix B** and the corresponding results are presented in **Volume 2—Customer Survey Data Tables**.

The survey was randomly distributed, with aid from the Community Development Department staff, to 800 recent customers (from January of 1999 to April of 2000) of the Development Services, Long Range Planning, Building and Fire Marshal Divisions. Surveys were returned in a manner that promoted confidentiality via mail to the County Auditor and sent unopened to Citygate staff, who then tabulated and analyzed the survey. The returned surveys totaled 149, for a good response rate of 18.6 percent.

The survey instrument allowed for respondents to fall into one or more response groups that described the type of interactions they had with the Community Development Department. A breakdown of the respondent composition is presented in the following table. Not only did respondents indicate the type of customer they were, but respondents also identified the type of construction they were involved in and their frequency of interaction with the Department. Since respondents were able to select more than one choice, the totals below exceed 100 percent.

RESPONDENT COMPOSITION

Respondent Type	Percentage of Respondents
Neighborhood Stakeholder	28.2%
Developer/Builder	46.3%
Development Consultant	21.5%
General Contractor/Sub-Contractor	30.9%
Type of Construction	
Single Family Detached	57.0%
Single Family Attached/Multi-family	29.5%
Commercial/Industrial	49.7%
Reason for Interaction	
New Construction Project	79.9%
Modification to Existing Project	19.5%
Both	30.2%
Frequency of Interaction	
Frequent Customer	83.2%
One-time Customer	33.6%

The customers responded to questions on a scale of one to three. For example, a score of 1 would show a low level of satisfaction, while a score of 3 would demonstrate a high level of satisfaction. For the reader's convenience, we translated the mean scores to a letter grade based on the following scale:

Letter Grade Corresponding to Range of Mean Scores	
A+	2.87 – 3.00
A	2.74 – 2.86
A-	2.60 – 2.73
B+	2.47 – 2.59
B	2.34 – 2.46
B-	2.20 – 2.33
C+	2.07 – 2.19
C	1.94 – 2.06
C-	1.80 – 1.93
D+	1.67 – 1.79
D	1.54 – 1.66
D-	1.40 – 1.53
F	1.00 – 1.39

B. ANALYSIS OF THE CUSTOMER SURVEY RESULTS

Summary:

The closed-ended questions indicate that the Community Development Department as a whole delivers many aspects of customer service at a below satisfactory level. The respondents indicated that many processes within the Department were not executed in a timely fashion and that the department staff in general did not have a solid understanding of private business. The results varied by division; however, no single division achieved an "A" grade on any question.

The open-ended questions supported the findings in the closed-ended section and shed light on customer perceptions about the source of the problems. Customers wrote that they were frustrated with long delays and the failure to provide adequate levels of customer service. Customers pointed to a wide range of perceived causes for these problems including a lack of leadership, staff apathy, and a lack of objectivity or clear standards for code interpretation.

In the following pages, we review the results for the Department as a whole, in addition to a series of questions rating each division.

Community Development Department

Question 2 asks customers to "rate the Community Development Department in the following areas." The results are displayed in the table below.

Question 2	Grade	Average Score	Low	Medium	High	Number
Courtesy	B	2.37	3%	57%	40%	139
Timeliness	D	1.55	59%	26%	14%	140
Positive Attitude	C	1.96	27%	50%	23%	137
Knowledge	C+	2.14	18%	50%	32%	135
Dependability / Reliability	D+	1.77	39%	44%	16%	135
Consistency	D+	1.73	46%	34%	19%	134
Fairness / Objectivity	C	1.97	28%	48%	25%	134
Problem Solving Ability	D+	1.75	40%	44%	16%	134
Returning Phone Calls	D+	1.67	50%	33%	17%	133
Quality of Advice	C	1.94	28%	50%	22%	128
Understanding of Private Business	D-	1.5	59%	31%	10%	115
Decision-making Capability	D+	1.71	43%	42%	15%	136
Level of Discretion	C	2.01	23%	53%	24%	118
Overall Performance	C-	1.81	35%	50%	15%	139

From the results above, Department staff is courteous and knowledgeable, but could significantly improve the timeliness of its service and its understanding of private business. Throughout the survey, customer concerns typically centered on both the process and the level of service provided. Customers contended in the open-response section that these concerns were primarily the results of poor staff responsiveness, lack of timeliness and ineffective leadership.

Neighborhood stakeholders, general/sub-contractors and single family detached customers tended to have a better opinion of the service provided by the Department. Especially in the single family detached category, those involved in modification to homes were more pleased than those involved in the new construction of homes. Overall, frequent customers were substantially less satisfied than one time customers.

The American Customer Satisfaction Index provides data on customer satisfaction among government agencies. The Index is based on a scale that runs from 0 to 100. To provide a rough basis of comparison we have indexed the Department's average score to the same scale. As shown in the table below, the Department is indexed at 42.4. **Exhibit III-1**, on the following page, shows the index scores of several Federal Government agencies. The Community Development Department is far below the aggregated score of 68.6 and well below the Internal Revenue Service and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, both scoring 51.

Question 2	Grade	Average Score	Index (0-100)
Average All Items	C-	1.85	42.4

American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI)

U.S. Government

December 13, 1999

FEDERAL AGENCIES (Categorized by service/product delivered to chosen customer segments)			
ACSI INDICES (0-100 scale)			
ID	AGENCY/DEPARTMENT	CUSTOMER SEGMENT	ACSI
	Federal Government (Aggregated)		68.6
	Services Through Local and State		80
ACF	Administration for Families & Children, HHS	Parents of Head Start students	87
FNS	Food and Nutrition Service, Agriculture	WIC Program recipients	83
HUD	Department of Housing & Urban Development	Community Development Block Grant recipients	69
	Earned Benefits		77
SSA	Social Security Administration	Recent retirement benefits recipients	82
VHA	Veterans Health Administration, VA	Outpatients at VHA clinics	79
OPM	Office of Personnel Management	Federal retirees and annuitants	75
HCFA	Health Care Financing Administration, HHS	Recent Medicare beneficiaries	71
VBA	Veterans Benefits Administration, VA	Veteran compensation/ benefit claimants	61
	Public Information		75
Ed-Pubs	Education Publications, Education	Primary users of education publications	80
NASA	National Aeronautics & Space Administration	Educators participating recently in NASA Center programs	80
GSA	General Services Administration	Users of the Consumer Information Center	77
BOC	Bureau of the Census, Commerce	Data distributors in depository libraries, state and local agencies	70
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency	Reference librarians accessing EPA website	69
	Recreational Land Users		72
NPS	National Park Service, Interior	Recreational visitors	73
Forest	National Forest Service, Agriculture	Recreational visitors	70
BLM	Bureau of Land Management, Interior	Recreational visitors	64
	Applicants and Users		71
Mint	U.S. Mint, Treasury	Buyers of numismatic & commemorative coins	86
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency	Disaster assistance recipients, 1997-8	73
SFA	Student Financial Assistance, Education	Electronic applicants for Title IV aid	63
NSF	National Science Foundation	Grant applicants, 1998	57
PTO	Patent & Trademark Office, Commerce	Recent individual patent & trademark applicants	57
	International Travelers		68
Consular	Consular Affairs, State	Recent passport applicants/renewals	73
INS	Immigration & Naturalization Service, Justice	International travelers	69
Customs	Customs Service, Treasury	International air travelers	66
	Household Consumers		63
FDA	Food & Drug Administration, HHS	Principal grocery shoppers & food preparers	66
FSIS	Food Safety & Inspection Service, Agriculture	Principal grocery shoppers & food preparers	62
	Tax Filers		
IRS	Internal Revenue Service, Treasury	All tax filers	51
IRS	Internal Revenue Service, Treasury	Electronic tax filers	74
	Regulation Users		55
FAA	Federal Aviation Administration, Transportation	Commercial pilots	58
OSHA	Occupational Safety & Health Administration, Labor	Health and safety professionals	51
Source: National Quality Research Center, University of Michigan Business School			

Development Services Division

Development Services showed significantly low scores. The results for the Division are presented in the table below.

Question 3	Grade	Average Score	Expectations			Number
			Below	Met	Above	
Helpfulness of Front Counter Assistance	C	2.04	14%	68%	18%	111
Informative Brochures and Handouts	C	1.98	18%	65%	17%	94
Pre-application Review Meeting	D	1.61	46%	47%	7%	98
Usefulness of Pre-application Review Written Comments	D+	1.73	35%	56%	9%	91
Application Checklist Requirements	C-	1.82	28%	61%	10%	106
Cost of Processing Application (fees)	C	1.94	35%	37%	29%	104
Process for Deeming Application Complete	D-	1.46	58%	38%	4%	104
Thoroughness of Plan Review	D	1.66	42%	50%	8%	102
Processing / Turnaround Times of Plan Review	D-	1.4	71%	18%	11%	110
Timeliness of Staff Written Comments	D-	1.45	62%	31%	7%	107
Clarity of Development Code	D	1.64	40%	57%	4%	106
Fairness / Consistency of Code Interpretations	D+	1.74	49%	49%	3%	105
Communication on Project Status	D-	1.4	62%	36%	2%	106
Use of Technology	C-	1.87	23%	67%	10%	82
Staff Dependability	D	1.59	47%	47%	6%	104
Coordinating Review with Other Divisions/Departments	D-	1.43	64%	29%	8%	91
Hearing Examiner Review Process	C	1.94	22%	63%	16%	64
Appeals Process	D+	1.69	40%	51%	9%	45
Site Development Review Process	D-	1.44	58%	40%	2%	88
Process of "Minor" Changes to Plans	D	1.59	51%	41%	9%	81
Timeliness of Re-checks	F	1.39	66%	29%	5%	82
Process for Final Plat Map Approval	F	1.38	68%	28%	4%	71
Process for Listening to Customer Concerns	D-	1.51	57%	37%	6%	93
Overall Process	F	1.36	67%	29%	4%	110

The overall process employed in Development Services and specifically the final plat map approval process received very low marks from customers. In addition, the timeliness of re-checks received a similarly low score. Although not a high mark, the service at the front counter and the division's brochures are reported as helpful.

It appears that once a customer begins the pre-application process, satisfaction begins to deteriorate. Numerous customers felt that their phone calls were not returned promptly. Many customers felt that they should receive regular updates on their project status without having to make repeated phone calls. Additionally, customers believed that some communication difficulties could be alleviated by the use of the County website to provide up-to-date project status information. Furthermore, the most common open-responses in the customer service category were that the Division needs to become more service-oriented and that it needs a better understanding of business.

One of the other primary areas of concern was related to the speed of processing. According to the customers, there is a lack of coordination with other divisions and departments. Customers perceive that the lack of coordination is compounded by the loss of documents pertaining to plans, inconsistency in code interpretation, staff turnover and a lack of employee accountability. One process that was mentioned more than any other specific process was the process for final plat map approval. Roughly 16 percent of those responding in the open response section mentioned the process as being extremely poor.

Another area of note was the consistency of development code interpretations. Some customers feel that staff personal agendas cloud judgements, which is coupled with an unclear development code and a perception that the staff lacks the necessary knowledge to complete its tasks.

Long Range Planning Division

Long Range Planning's customers rated the Division less than satisfactory. The scores for each question are displayed below.

Question 4	Grade	Average Score	Expectations			Number
			Below	Met	Above	
Helpfulness of Front Counter Assistance	C	1.96	19%	65%	16%	57
Informative Brochures and Handouts	C-	1.88	19%	73%	8%	52
Cost of Processing Application (fees)	C	1.94	24%	59%	18%	51
Application Checklist Requirements	C-	1.83	24%	69%	7%	54
Fairness / Consistency of Code Interpretations	D+	1.7	35%	59%	6%	54
Communication on Status of Work	D	1.57	48%	46%	6%	54
Use of Modern Planning Practices	D+	1.7	37%	56%	7%	43
Receptive to Change	D-	1.42	67%	25%	8%	48
Use of Technology	D+	1.73	37%	54%	10%	41
Staff Dependability	D	1.6	44%	52%	4%	52
Coordinating Review with other Departments/Divisions	D	1.55	51%	43%	6%	49
Timeliness of Staff Written Comments	D-	1.47	57%	39%	4%	51
Overall Process	D	1.6	45%	49%	5%	55

Customers felt strongly that the Division was not receptive to change. They also were not pleased with the timeliness of staff comments or with the coordination of review with other divisions or departments. Although the score was below the midpoint of the scale, most customers appear to appreciate the help they receive at the front counter.

While the customers are dissatisfied with the level of service provided by long-range planning in the closed-end section, open-ended responses varied. This indicates that the experience of those interacting with the division varies. The most frequent open responses occurred only two or three times and were related to communication, more timely information on growth management, more of a common sense approach, and increased use of technology. Beyond these results the rest were scattered; some of these responses can be seen in the bullets below.

- ◆ Work with stakeholders long in advance, don't just send notices of code change hearings.
- ◆ Staff needs to have their facts straight.
- ◆ Increase knowledge of business and commerce.
- ◆ Stop assessing taxes without voter approval by use of fees.
- ◆ Reduce in-house conflicts on opinions and authority.
- ◆ Needs to concentrate on addressing and processing issues and directives that come out of Commissioner's office and not promoting own agenda, which delays actions on other issues.
- ◆ With infill proposals, give adjacent property owners representation during pre-planning review, which could provide a more open process.

- ◆ Coordination and assistance to landowners for annexed areas (i.e. County written agreements for use of parcels that are no longer honored by city.)
- ◆ Treat customers like taxpayers instead of the “enemy”.
- ◆ More flexibility in land-use planning.
- ◆ Better customer service.

Building Division

The Building Division is for the most part providing adequate services to its customers. The customer concerns are similar to those found in the Department as a whole. The results are shown in the table below.

Question 5	Grade	Average Score	Expectations			Number
			Below	Met	Above	
Helpfulness of Front Counter Assistance	B-	2.21	10%	59%	31%	100
Informative Brochures and Handouts	C	2.01	16%	67%	17%	81
Cost of Permits (fees)	C	1.97	28%	46%	25%	95
Thoroughness of Plan Review	C-	1.88	22%	68%	10%	91
Processing / Turnaround Times of Plan Review	D	1.54	60%	26%	14%	95
Complexity of Regulations	C-	1.88	31%	50%	19%	94
Fairness / Consistency of Code Interpretations	D+	1.76	35%	54%	11%	94
Communication on Project Status	D	1.62	48%	41%	11%	93
Use of Technology	C-	1.9	24%	63%	13%	68
Staff Dependability	D+	1.78	35%	53%	13%	95
Timeliness of Inspections	C	1.98	21%	60%	19%	90
Thoroughness of Inspections	C	2.05	14%	67%	19%	85
Fairness of Inspections	C	1.98	18%	66%	16%	87
Conflicts between Inspectors and Approved Plans	C-	1.9	23%	65%	13%	80
Overall Process	C-	1.84	29%	58%	13%	96

Customers gave reasonably good marks to the front counter assistance and informational materials as well as to the thoroughness of the inspections. The areas where customers were least satisfied with the Division involved processing times and project status communication.

The open-ended responses reflect these findings with most concerns focused on turnaround times and customer service/communication of project status. The customers primarily want responses to their inquiries on project status, and to improve the courtesy of responses. The open-ended section also indicates that customer service has been improving. In fact, compared to the other divisions, Building Service had the greatest percentage of its respondents noting improvements.

Fire Marshal Division

Customers rated the Fire Marshal's Division in relatively close proximity to the midpoint of the scale on all items. The table below details the results.

Question 6	Grade	Average Score	Expectations			Number
			Below	Met	Above	
Informative Publications/Handouts/ Brochures	C	1.94	21%	63%	15%	52
Cost of Permits (fees)	C+	2.11	12%	65%	23%	57
Thoroughness of Plan Review	C	1.98	14%	75%	12%	59
Processing / Turnaround Times of Plan Review	C-	1.88	25%	62%	13%	63
Complexity of Regulations	C-	1.89	25%	62%	13%	61
Fairness / Consistency of Code Interpretations	C-	1.87	29%	55%	16%	62
Communication on Project Status	C-	1.89	25%	62%	13%	61
Use of Technology	C-	1.87	23%	66%	11%	47
Staff Dependability	C	2.03	18%	61%	21%	57
Timeliness of Inspections	C+	2.09	15%	60%	25%	53
Thoroughness of Inspections	C+	2.09	16%	59%	25%	56
Fairness of Inspections	C	2.02	19%	61%	20%	54
Conflicts between Inspectors and Approved Plans	C-	1.87	28%	57%	15%	46
Overall Process	C	2.02	17%	63%	19%	63

The Division received its highest mark on the cost of permits and the timeliness and thoroughness of its inspections. It garnered lower scores on the fairness and consistency of code interpretations, conflicts between inspectors and approved plans, and the use of technology.

The open-ended responses indicated very few problems within the Division, but did suggest that there may be some concerns over inter-departmental communication. Some would like to have more information about the code available; some suggested having it updated regularly online.

Final Concerns and Solutions

The final survey questions allowed respondents to consider various solutions to their concerns, as well as gather very general information about the cost of doing business in Clark County. The results are found below. Respondents who answered “not applicable” or left the question blank are not considered in the analysis below.

POTENTIAL SOLUTIONS

Question 7	Percent Answering “Yes”	Percent Answering “No”
Initial information given to me by the Department was accurate.	62%	38%
The Department required changes after initial plan check.	63%	37%
If it were guaranteed that an increase in fees would increase timeliness and quality of services, I would support a fee increase.	35%	65%
I would welcome the option to pay extra for “express processing”	51%	49%
I would support a faster, more streamlined development process, even if it meant more “black and white/pass or fail” requirements and fewer negotiations.	52%	48%
I charge my clients more for services I perform in Clark County than other jurisdictions in the Portland metropolitan area.	49%	51%
The cost of processing any permit is approximately the same as other jurisdictions in the Portland/Vancouver metropolitan area.	28%	72%

These results indicate a lukewarm reception to the potential solutions identified in the survey. Customers believe the cost of permit processing is not the same in Clark County as in the rest of the Portland metropolitan area. In fact, just under half of the respondents reported charging more

for services in Clark County. Additionally, just over one in three customers reported they did not initially receive accurate information from the Department.

The final open-ended responses shed some light on the reasons for customers' tepid response to these process enhancements and the Department as a whole. The ten most common responses are listed below.

MOST COMMON RESPONSES

Response	Number of Respondents
Need to improve leadership	21
Code information and interpretation not consistent	20
Fees are too high, don't raise them	20
Employee culture and organization needs improvement	19
Employees need increased customer service skills	19
Employee training needed, especially in the engineering staff	17
Overall process needs improvement	13
Timeframe needs improvement	12
Express processing is a bad idea	9
The Department is difficult to work with	9

The recommendations for improvement formulated by Citygate were developed through a variety of analytical methods, including the input from customers described above. By implementing the recommendations presented in this report, the Department can improve customers' perceptions of its service delivery, and at the same time, enhance the Department's credibility.

Appendix B – 2002 Customer Survey Instrument

**Clark County
Community Development Department
CUSTOMER SURVEY**



Thank you for taking the time to fill out this important survey. We ask that you fill out the survey based upon your experiences with the Department during the past year.

1. Please Mark Below All Categories That Apply to You as a Customer:

- ☐ **Neighborhood Stakeholder** *Frequent Customer___ or One-time/Infrequent Customer___?*
(e.g., Neighborhood Committee, nearby affected property owner)
- ☐ **Developer/Builder** *Frequent Customer___ or One-time/Infrequent Customer___?*
- ☐ **Development Consultant** *Frequent Customer___ or One-time/Infrequent Customer___?*
(e.g., Engineer, Architect, lawyer, planner, etc.)
- ☐ **General/Sub Contractor** *Frequent Customer___ or One-time/Infrequent Customer___?*

Type of project(s) involved with:

- ☐ **Single Family Detached** *New construction___ or Modification___?*
- ☐ **Single Family Attached/Multi-family** *New construction___ or Modification___?*
- ☐ **Commercial/Industrial Facility** *New construction___ or Modification___?*

2. Overall, How Would You Rate the Community Development Department in the Following Areas?

	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	N/A
Courtesy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Timeliness	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Positive Attitude	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Knowledge	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Dependability / Reliability	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Consistency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fairness / Objectivity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Problem Solving Ability	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Returning Phone Calls	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Quality of Advice	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Understanding of Private Business	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Decision-making Capability	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Level of Discretion	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overall Performance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please answer Questions 3 through 7 for each of the following Divisions (Development Services, Long-Range Planning, Building, Fire Marshal, and Engineering) that you have had experience with during the past year. If you have not had business with the division listed during this time period, skip to Question 8.

3. Please check the box that best represents your assessment of how the **DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DIVISION** (Subdivisions, Site Plan Review, Variances, Conditional Use Permits, etc.) compares to your expectations for government service.

	Below Expecta- tions	Met Expecta- tions	Above Expecta- tions	No Opinion
Helpfulness of Front Counter Assistance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Informative Brochures and Handouts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pre-application Review Meeting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Usefulness of Pre-application Review Written Comments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Application Checklist Requirements	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cost of Processing Application (fees)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Process for Deeming Application Complete	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Thoroughness of Plan Review	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Processing / Turnaround Times of Plan Review	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Timeliness of Staff Written Comments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Clarity of Development Code	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fairness / Consistency of Code Interpretations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Communication on Project Status	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Use of Technology	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Staff Dependability	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Coordinating Review with Other Divisions/Departments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Hearing Examiner Review Process	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Appeals Process	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site Development Review Process	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Process of "Minor" Changes to Plans	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Timeliness of Re-checks	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Process for Final Plat Map Approval	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Process for Listening to Customer Concerns	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overall Process	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Have you noted any positive changes in the services provided in Development Services Division during the past year? If so, what?

In what areas should this Division focus attention in the next year to provide excellent service to the public?

4. Please check the box that best represents your assessment of how the **LONG RANGE PLANNING DIVISION** (Comprehensive Plan Amendments, Zone Changes, Overlay Zones, etc.) compares to your expectations for government service.

	Below Expecta- tions	Met Expecta- tions	Above Expecta- tions	No Opinion
Helpfulness of Front Counter Assistance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Informative Brochures and Handouts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cost of Processing Application (fees)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Application Checklist Requirements	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fairness / Consistency of Code Interpretations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Communication on Status of Work	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Use of Modern Planning Practices	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Receptive to Change	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Use of Technology	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Staff Dependability	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Coordinating Review with other Departments/Divisions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Timeliness of Staff Written Comments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overall Process	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Have you noted any positive changes in the services provided in the Long-Range Planning Division during the past year? If so, what?

In what areas should this Division focus attention in the next year to provide excellent service to the public?

5. Please check the box that best represents your assessment of how the **BUILDING SERVICES DIVISION** (Building Permits, Plumbing Permits, Electrical Permits, etc.) compares to your expectations for government service.

	Below Expecta- tions	Met Expecta- tions	Above Expecta- tions	No Opinion
Helpfulness of Front Counter Assistance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Informative Brochures and Handouts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cost of Permits (fees)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Thoroughness of Plan Review	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Processing / Turnaround Times of Plan Review	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Complexity of Regulations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fairness / Consistency of Code Interpretations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Communication on Project Status	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Use of Technology	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Staff Dependability	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Timeliness of Inspections	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Thoroughness of Inspections	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fairness of Inspections	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Conflicts between Inspectors and Approved Plans	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overall Process	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Have you noted any positive changes in the services provided in the Building Services Division during the past year? If so, what?

In what areas should this Division focus attention in the next year to provide excellent service to the public?

6. Please check the box that best represents your assessment of how the **FIRE MARSHAL SERVICES DIVISION** (building and site plan reviews) compares to your expectations for government service.

	Below Expecta- tions	Met Expecta- tions	Above Expecta- tions	No Opinion
Informative Publications/Handouts/ Brochures	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cost of Permits (fees)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Thoroughness of Plan Review	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Processing / Turnaround Times of Plan Review	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Complexity of Regulations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fairness / Consistency of Code Interpretations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Communication on Project Status	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Use of Technology	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Staff Dependability	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Timeliness of Inspections	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Thoroughness of Inspections	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fairness of Inspections	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Conflicts between Inspectors and Approved Plans	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overall Process	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Have you noted any positive changes in the services provided in the Fire Marshal Division during the past year? If so, what?

In what areas should this Division focus attention in the next year to provide excellent service to the public?

7. Please check the box that represents your assessment of how the Engineering Division (Construction Plan Review, Development Inspections, Final Plan Approval, etc.) compares to your expectations for government service.

	Below Expecta- tions	Met Expecta- tions	Above Expecta- tions	No Opinion
Helpfulness of Front Counter Assistance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Informative Brochures and Handouts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Application Checklist Requirements	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cost of Processing Application (fees)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Process for Deeming Application Complete	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Thoroughness of Construction Plan Review	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Processing / Turnaround Times of Construction Plan Review	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Timeliness of Staff Written Comments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Clarity of Development Code	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fairness / Consistency of Code Interpretations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Communication on Project Status	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Use of Technology	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Staff Dependability	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Coordinating Review with Other Divisions/Departments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Timeliness of Development Inspection	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fairness / Consistency of Development Inspection	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Process of "Minor" Changes to Plans	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Timeliness of Re-checks	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Number of Re-checks	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Process for Final Site Plan Approval	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Process for Final Plat Map Approval	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Process for Listening to Customer Concerns	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overall Process	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Have you noticed any positive changes in the services provided in the Engineering Division during the past year? If so, what?

In what areas should this Division focus attention in the next year to provide excellent service to the public?

8. **Please Answer “Yes”, “No” or “Not Applicable” to the Following Questions:**

	Yes	No	N/A
Initial information given to me by the Department was accurate.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The Department required changes to project after initial plan check.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The Department required changes to project after the second plan check.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
If it were guaranteed that an increase in fees would increase timeliness and quality of services, I would support a fee increase.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I would welcome the option to pay extra for “express” processing.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I would support a faster, more streamlined development process, even if it meant more “black and white/pass or fail” requirements and fewer negotiations.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I charge my clients more for services I perform in Clark County than in other jurisdictions in the Portland metropolitan area.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The cost of processing any permit is approximately the same as other jurisdictions in the Portland/Vancouver metropolitan area.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

9. **Please Add Any Specific Comments or Suggestions you may have for Improving Services in a Specific Division or the Department as a Whole:**

Please use backside for additional comments.

Thank You.

Should you need assistance regarding this survey, please contact Randy Tan at Citygate, rtan@citygateassociates.com or at 1-800-275-2764, ext. 105.

Additional Comments:

Appendix C – 2002 Detailed Survey Results

- ◆ Community Development Department
- ◆ Development Services Division
- ◆ Long Range Planning Division
- ◆ Building Division
- ◆ Fire Marshal Division
- ◆ Engineering Division

Community Development Department

Question 2	Grade	Average Score	Low	Medium	High	Number
Courtesy	B+	2.54	5%	36%	59%	146
Timeliness	C-	1.83	38%	40%	21%	146
Positive Attitude	B-	2.21	15%	49%	36%	146
Knowledge	B-	2.27	13%	47%	40%	144
Dependability / Reliability	C	2.04	25%	45%	29%	139
Consistency	C	1.97	32%	38%	29%	139
Fairness / Objectivity	C+	2.08	24%	44%	32%	142
Problem Solving Ability	C	1.99	30%	41%	28%	140
Returning Phone Calls	C	2.02	27%	44%	29%	135
Quality of Advice	C+	2.12	17%	53%	30%	138
Understanding of Private Business	D	1.57	54%	35%	11%	117
Decision-making Capability	C-	1.87	34%	46%	21%	136
Level of Discretion	C+	2.19	15%	52%	33%	123
Overall Performance	C	2.05	22%	51%	27%	145

Development Services Division

Question 3	Grade	Average Score	Expectations			Number
			Below	Met	Above	
Helpfulness of Front Counter Assistance	C+	2.15	10%	66%	25%	125
Informative Brochures and Handouts	C	1.96	15%	74%	11%	99
Pre-application Review Meeting	C-	1.86	24%	65%	11%	94
Usefulness of Pre-application Review Written Comments	D+	1.78	30%	61%	8%	96
Application Checklist Requirements	C-	1.80	27%	65%	7%	110
Cost of Processing Application (fees)	C-	1.87	34%	46%	20%	113
Process for Deeming Application Complete	D	1.58	45%	51%	4%	106
Thoroughness of Plan Review	C-	1.80	30%	60%	10%	113
Processing / Turnaround Times of Plan Review	D-	1.51	56%	37%	7%	116
Timeliness of Staff Written Comments	D+	1.67	39%	55%	6%	103
Clarity of Development Code	D	1.61	41%	57%	2%	105
Fairness / Consistency of Code Interpretations	D	1.58	46%	49%	5%	106
Communication on Project Status	D+	1.71	36%	56%	7%	108
Use of Technology	C	2.00	12%	77%	12%	94
Staff Dependability	C-	1.83	31%	55%	14%	110
Coordinating Review with Other Divisions/Departments	D	1.61	45%	49%	6%	104
Hearing Examiner Review Process	C	2.00	18%	64%	18%	72
Appeals Process	C-	1.84	25%	65%	10%	51
Site Development Review Process	D	1.61	46%	46%	8%	93
Process of "Minor" Changes to Plans	D+	1.68	43%	46%	11%	91
Timeliness of Re-checks	D+	1.67	41%	51%	8%	86
Process for Final Plat Map Approval	D	1.54	49%	48%	3%	69
Process for Listening to Customer Concerns	D+	1.75	37%	51%	12%	103
Overall Process	D+	1.68	39%	54%	7%	112

Long Range Planning Division

Question 4		Average	Expectations			
	Grade	Score	Below	Met	Above	Number
Helpfulness of Front Counter Assistance	C	2.00	14%	73%	14%	51
Informative Brochures and Handouts	C	1.94	15%	77%	9%	47
Cost of Processing Application (fees)	C-	1.83	35%	46%	19%	48
Application Checklist Requirements	C-	1.87	20%	74%	7%	46
Fairness / Consistency of Code Interpretations	D+	1.67	41%	51%	8%	51
Communication on Status of Work	D+	1.79	33%	54%	13%	48
Use of Modern Planning Practices	C-	1.93	20%	66%	14%	44
Receptive to Change	D	1.55	53%	39%	8%	49
Use of Technology	C	1.98	18%	67%	16%	45
Staff Dependability	C-	1.86	27%	61%	12%	49
Coordinating Review with other Departments/Divisions	D	1.65	43%	49%	8%	49
Timeliness of Staff Written Comments	D+	1.70	36%	57%	6%	47
Overall Process	C-	1.80	29%	61%	10%	51

Building Division

Question 5		Average	Expectations			
	Grade	Score	Below	Met	Above	Number
Helpfulness of Front Counter Assistance	B-	2.32	9%	49%	42%	108
Informative Brochures and Handouts	C	2.00	14%	73%	14%	80
Cost of Permits (fees)	C-	1.87	33%	47%	20%	103
Thoroughness of Plan Review	C	2.00	14%	72%	14%	99
Processing / Turnaround Times of Plan Review	D+	1.69	43%	45%	12%	102
Complexity of Regulations	C	1.94	23%	60%	17%	96
Fairness / Consistency of Code Interpretations	C-	1.88	27%	59%	14%	98
Communication on Project Status	C-	1.85	29%	56%	15%	96
Use of Technology	C	1.99	15%	71%	14%	87
Staff Dependability	C	2.05	16%	64%	21%	102
Timeliness of Inspections	B-	2.22	10%	57%	32%	96
Thoroughness of Inspections	C+	2.10	12%	65%	23%	97
Fairness of Inspections	C	1.99	19%	63%	18%	94
Conflicts between Inspectors and Approved Plans	C-	1.80	28%	63%	9%	82
Overall Process	C+	2.09	13%	64%	22%	104

Fire Marshal Division

Question 6	Grade	Average Score	Expectations			Number
			Below	Met	Above	
Informative Publications/Handouts/ Brochures	C	2.05	14%	68%	18%	44
Cost of Permits (fees)	C	2.06	11%	72%	17%	54
Thoroughness of Plan Review	C	1.97	21%	62%	17%	63
Processing / Turnaround Times of Plan Review	C-	1.89	28%	55%	17%	64
Complexity of Regulations	C-	1.89	24%	63%	13%	62
Fairness / Consistency of Code Interpretations	C-	1.83	33%	52%	16%	64
Communication on Project Status	C-	1.89	27%	56%	16%	62
Use of Technology	C-	1.93	18%	71%	11%	56
Staff Dependability	C	2.05	17%	60%	22%	63
Timeliness of Inspections	C+	2.11	9%	70%	20%	54
Thoroughness of Inspections	C+	2.13	7%	73%	20%	55
Fairness of Inspections	C+	2.09	13%	65%	22%	55
Conflicts between Inspectors and Approved Plans	C-	1.89	24%	63%	13%	54
Overall Process	C	2.06	14%	65%	21%	63

Engineering Division

Question 7	Grade	Average Score	Expectations			Number
			Below	Met	Above	
Helpfulness of Front Counter Assistance	C	1.96	20%	64%	16%	74
Informative Brochures and Handouts	C-	1.80	26%	67%	7%	61
Application Checklist Requirements	C-	1.81	27%	65%	8%	74
Cost of Processing Application (fees)	C-	1.83	38%	42%	21%	72
Process for Deeming Application Complete	D+	1.67	44%	44%	11%	70
Thoroughness of Construction Plan Review	D+	1.75	34%	56%	10%	73
Processing / Turnaround Times of Construction Plan Review	D	1.54	54%	38%	8%	74
Timeliness of Staff Written Comments	D	1.66	44%	47%	10%	73
Clarity of Development Code	D+	1.67	42%	48%	10%	73
Fairness / Consistency of Code Interpretations	D	1.60	48%	44%	8%	73
Communication on Project Status	D	1.63	46%	44%	10%	71
Use of Technology	C-	1.92	17%	73%	9%	64
Staff Dependability	D+	1.75	36%	53%	11%	75
Coordinating Review with Other Divisions/Departments	D	1.60	50%	40%	10%	70
Timeliness of Development Inspection	C	1.95	21%	62%	16%	61
Fairness / Consistency of Development Inspection	C-	1.85	27%	60%	13%	62
Process of “Minor” Changes to Plans	D+	1.71	38%	52%	9%	65
Timeliness of Re-checks	D	1.62	46%	46%	8%	61
Number of Re-checks	D	1.58	51%	41%	8%	59
Process for Final Site Plan Approval	D	1.56	49%	47%	4%	68
Process for Final Plat Map Approval	D	1.54	51%	44%	5%	57
Process for Listening to Customer Concerns	D+	1.73	40%	48%	12%	73
Overall Process	D+	1.67	42%	48%	10%	73